



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,096	03/31/2004	Ying Yu Kuo	88910-32US0	5658
22504 7590 06/07/2010 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP/Seattle 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2200 SEATTLE, WA 98101-3045				
EXAMINER				
ZUBAJLO, JENNIFER L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/07/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/813,096

**Applicant(s)**

KUO ET AL.

**Examiner**

JENNIFER ZUBAJLO

**Art Unit**

2629

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6 and 18-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6 and 18-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4,6,18-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin Meckesheimer (Pub. No.: US 2005/0162396 A1).

As to claim 1, Meckesheimer teaches a method performed by a wireless data input device, comprising a wireless receiving device and a wireless transmitting device, wherein the wireless transmitting device (see fig. 1A – transmitter 11), and comprises a microcontroller (see [0049] “a controller may be coupled to the transmitter for generating the signal 50”), the method comprising: generating an identification code at the microcontroller without reading the identification code from any memory, the identification code identifying the wireless transmitting device (see [0027] – “the identification code 15 may have a generic device descriptive identity, a user specified identity, a unique identity, or any other type of identity known to a skilled person in the art” and [0049] “a controller may be coupled to the transmitter for generating the signal 50, wherein the signal 50 comprises one or more identification codes”); sending at least one packet from the wireless transmitting device to the wireless receiving device

wherein the at least one packet comprises the identification code generated by the microcontroller (see [0049]); receiving at least the at least one packet at the wireless receiving device (see fig. 1A – receiver 13); for each packet received by the wireless receiving device, determining whether the received packet comprises the identification code (see [0029] “the electronic updateable static display a customer specific message when a portion of the received signal matches the identification code 15 of the placard 10” - note that it would be obvious to determine if the received packet comprises the identification code since the identification code transmitted must match the identification code of the placard in order to display the message); if the received packet comprises the identification code, recognizing the received packet as having been transmitted by the wireless transmitting device (see [0029]); and if the received packet does not comprise the identification code, ignoring the received packet (see [0029] – note that it would be obvious because if the id code does not match that of the placard then no message would be displayed and therefore ignored if there is no id code).

As to claim 23, Meckesheimer teaches a wireless system comprising: a computing device; a wireless receiving device connected to the computing device (see fig. 1A – receiver 13), and configured to receive data packets wirelessly, the wireless receiving device being further configured to communicate at least a portion of the data in the received data packets to the computing device (see [0029]); and a wireless transmitting device comprising a microcontroller (see fig 1A and [0049] “a controller may be coupled to the transmitter for generating the signal 50”), configured to generate an

identification code without having first read the identification code from any memory , the identification code identifying the wireless transmitting device (see [0027] – “the identification code 15 may have a generic device descriptive identity, a user specified identity, a unique identity, or any other type of identity known to a skilled person in the art” and [0049] “a controller may be coupled to the transmitter for generating the signal 50, wherein the signal 50 comprises one or more identification codes”), wherein when the wireless transmitting device is operated, the wireless transmitting device transmits user input data to the wireless receiving device in one or more data packets also comprising the identification code, the computing device is further operable to recognize data packets received by the wireless receiving device comprising the identification code as having been transmitted by the wireless transmitting device (see [0029] “the electronic updateable static display a customer specific message when a portion of the received signal matches the identification code 15 of the placard 10” - note that it would be obvious to determine if the received packet comprises the identification code since the identification code transmitted must match the identification code of the placard in order to display the message), and the computing device is further operable to ignore data packets received by the wireless receiving device not comprising the identification code (see [0029] – note that it would be obvious because if the id code does not match that of the placard then no message would be displayed and therefore ignored if there is no id code).

As to claim 2, Meckesheimer teaches the method of claim 1 (see above rejection), further comprising: connecting the wireless receiving device to a computer having a display device; and if the received packet comprises the identification code, displaying a message on the display device indicating that the wireless receiving device is receiving normally (see [0029]).

As to claim 3, Meckesheimer teaches the method of claim 1 (see above rejection), wherein the wireless transmitting device is a user operated portion of one of a wireless mouse, a wireless keyboard, a wireless joy stick, or a wireless pointing device (note Examiner is taking Official notice that it is well known in the art for wireless transmitting devices to be one of a wireless mouse, a wireless keyboard, a wireless joy stick, or a wireless pointing device)..

As to claim 4, Meckesheimer teaches the method of claim 1 (see above rejection), wherein the wireless receiving device is a wireless receiver for one of a wireless mouse, a wireless keyboard, a wireless joy stick, or a wireless pointing device (note since Examiner is taking Official notice that it is well known in the art for wireless transmitting devices to be one of a wireless mouse, a wireless keyboard, a wireless joy stick, or a wireless pointing device, it would then follow that the receiving device is a receiver of one of the transmitting devices).

As to claim 6, Meckesheimer teaches the method of claim 1 (see above rejection), wherein the wireless receiving device comprises a non-volatile memory, and the method further comprises: storing the identification code in the non-volatile memory of the wireless receiving device (see [0027] and fig. 1A – memory 18, receiver 13, and ID code 15 – note that Examiner is taking Official Notice that it is common and well known in the art for a wireless receiving device to have non-volatile memory for storing data).

As to claim 18, Meckesheimer teaches the method of claim 6 (see above rejection), wherein determining whether the received packet comprises the identification code comprises: obtaining the identification code of the received packet; reading the identification code from the non-volatile memory; comparing the identification code of the received packet to the identification code read from the non-volatile memory; and determining the received packet comprises the identification code when the identification code of the received packet is identical to the identification code read from the non-volatile memory of the wireless receiving device (see [0029] "the electronic updateable static display a customer specific message when a portion of the received signal matches the identification code 15 of the placard 10" - note that it would be obvious to determine if the received packet comprises the identification code since the identification code transmitted must match the identification code of the placard in order to display the message).

As to claim 19, Meckesheimer teaches the method of claim 18 (see above rejection), further comprising: when the wireless transmitting device is first set up, sending an initial packet from the wireless transmitting device to the wireless receiving device, wherein the initial packet comprises the identification code (see fig. 1A and [0027] - note that it is obvious for this transmission of id codes would be performed when set up occurs).

As to claim 20, Meckesheimer teaches the method of claim 19 (see above rejection), wherein the sending of the initial packet from the wireless transmitting device is triggered by inserting batteries into the wireless transmitting device (see [0030] - "the power source 17 may be capable of augmenting the capacitor 14 to supply the necessary power for updating, changing, clearing, or resetting the display" and "the power source 17 may be a battery").

As to claim 21, Meckesheimer teaches the method of claim 1 (see above rejection), wherein the received packet comprises device displacement information, and the method further comprises: if the received packet comprises the identification code, processing the device displacement information contained in the received packet (see [0029] - note that when the id codes match, the message is displayed and it would be obvious that any other information transmitted would be processed if the id codes matched).



As to claim 22, Meckesheimer teaches the method of claim 1 (see above rejection), wherein the received packet comprises key press information, and the method further comprises: if the received packet comprises the identification code, processing the key press information contained in the received packet (see [0029] – note that when the id codes match, the message is displayed and it would be obvious that any other information transmitted would be processed if the id codes matched).

As to claim 24, Meckesheimer teaches the wireless system of claim 23 (see above rejection), wherein the computing device determines the wireless receiving device is operating normally when the wireless receiving device receives a first packet comprising the identification code generated by the microcontroller (see fig 1A and [0029] note that if the information is displayed , this is an indication that the wireless receiving device is operating normally).

As to claim 25, Meckesheimer teaches the wireless system of claim 24 (see above rejection), wherein the computing device comprises a display and is further operable to display a message indicating whether the wireless receiving device is operating normally (see fig 1A and [0029] note that if the information is displayed , this is an indication that the wireless receiving device is operating normally).

As to claim 26, Meckesheimer teaches the wireless system of claim 24 (see above rejection), wherein when the wireless transmitting device is first set up for use,

the wireless transmitting device transmits an initial packet to the wireless receiving device comprising the identification code (see fig. 1A and [0027] - note that it is obvious for this transmission of id codes would be performed when set up occurs).

As to claim 27, Meckesheimer teaches the wireless system of claim 23 (see above rejection), wherein the wireless transmitting device is a user operated portion of one of a wireless mouse, a wireless keyboard, a wireless joy stick, or a wireless pointing device, and the wireless receiving device is a wireless receiver for the one of the wireless mouse, the wireless keyboard, the wireless joy stick, or the wireless pointing device (note Examiner is taking Official notice that it is well known in the art for wireless transmitting devices to be one of a wireless mouse, a wireless keyboard, a wireless joy stick, or a wireless pointing device and it would then follow that the receiving device is a receiver of one of the transmitting devices).

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 2/10/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. Applicant argues that "nothing in claim 18 or paragraph 51 of Meckesheimer et al. supports the argument that the controller generates the identification code without first reading it from memory".

Examiner disagrees. Examiner points to claim 18 of Meckesheimer "a controller coupled to the transmitter for generating the signal, wherein the signal comprises one or more identification codes, each identification code being associated with one of the plurality of placards, each identification code having associated with it a customer specific message". From this claim and [0051], it is obvious that the information of "a customer specific message associated with each of the placard identification codes" is from a database, not that the identification codes themselves are from the database. Therefore, Meckesheimer is still cited for the teaching of the limitation of claim 1 "generating an identification code at the microcontroller without reading the identification code from any memory" (see [0049], [0051], and claim 18).

5. Applicant argues that "At pages 2-3, the Office Action asserts that the transmitter 11 of Meckesheimer et al. corresponds to the wireless transmitting device recited in the claims and the receiver 13 of Meckesheimer et al. corresponds to the wireless receiving device recited in the claims. Thus, in Meckesheimer et al., the placard identification codes identify the wireless receiving devices, not the wireless transmitting device as recited in claims 1 and 23. Meckesheimer et al. discloses in some implementations the placards may transmit return signals. However, they do so after having accessed the identification code 15 stored in memory. (see page 5, paragraph 54). Therefore, Meckesheimer et al. fails to teach or suggest an identification code identifying a wireless transmitting device as recited in the pending claims."

Examiner disagrees. Paragraph [0027] of Meckesheimer states "the identification code 15 may have a generic device descriptive identity, a user specified

identity, a unique identity, or any other type of identity known to a skilled person in the art", therefore Meckesheimer includes the teaching of an identification code identifying a wireless transmitting device.

### ***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Patent No.: US 5,854,621; Pub. No.: US 2005/0200594 A1 and US 2003/0160767 A1.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENNIFER ZUBAJLO whose telephone number is (571)270-1551. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8 am - 5 pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amare Mengistu can be reached on (571) 272-7674. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jennifer Zubajlo/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2629  
5/30/10

/Amare Mengistu/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629